

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,536	07/27/2001	Sean James Martin	GB920010042US1	2124
7:	590 04/12/2006		EXAM	INER
RONALD A.	D'ALESSANDRO, 1	BLAIR, DOUGLAS B		
HOFFMAN, W	ARNICK & D' ALLE	SSANDRO LLC		
THREE-COMM SQUARE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALBANY, NY			2142	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1-
<u>_</u>

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/917,536	MARTIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Douglas B. Blair	2142	

Advisory Action	09/917,536	MARTIN ET AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Douglas B. Blair	2142			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addi	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.			
THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the 	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th		er is later. In no		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI	•	OWT NIHTIW C		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must I AMENDMENTS	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 		educing or simplifying	the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	-	jected claims.			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s 		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).	·	·	_		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proof the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of .		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-56</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		-	•		
 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 	•	_	nce because.		
13. Other:	(1 10/35/00 01 F10-1449) Fapel	Ma			
	BUNJO	B JAROENCHONW	ANIT		

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments appear to present 112 2nd problems because they appear to to be missing a word.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant is trying to claim a situation where a user stays in a queue when the user navigates away from a web site using the same browser. The applicant lists 3 embodiments in the specification: two involving applets and one involving a cookie. The situation that the applicant is trying to claim and argue only works for the embodiment using the cookie because when a browser leaves a web site all applets associated with that web site quit running and the specification provides no special details that would overcome this property of applets. Therefore any amendment that actually limits the claim to one browser should explicitly mention the use of a cookie to avoid a scope of enablement rejection. With regard to the applicant's arguments about claims 20 and 40, the applicant's arguments only further the assertion that the "desired maximum" is no more than an arbitrary design choice because the value of the "desired maximum" is based on the arbitrary desires of a person implementing the applicant's invention.